IN THE HIGH COURT OF KERALA AT ERNAKULAM

PRESENT :

THE HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE C.N.RAMACHANDRAN NAIR

MONDAY, THE 6TH AUGUST 2007 / 15TH SRAVANA 1929

WP(C).No. 13333 of 2007(K)

---

PETITIONER:

---

1. P.A.IBRAHIMKUTTY, DARUL-ABRAR,
   P.O.NADUVATH NAGAR, ALAPPUZHA DISTRICT.

2. T.P.AJAS, THELAPPALLIL,
   P.O.NADUVATH NAGAR, ALAPPUZHA DISTRICT.

3. A.K.MOHIYUDDEEN MOOPAN,
   AMITTATH, P.O.NADUVATH NAGAR,
   ALAPPUZHA DISTRICT.

4. T.A.MOHAMMEDKUTTY, MANAGER,
   NADUVATHUL ISLAM ORPHANAGE, P.O.NADUVATH NAGAR,
   ALAPPUZHA DISTRICT.

BY ADV. SRI.P.M.PAREETH

RESPONDENTS:

---

1. KERALA STATE ELECTRICITY BOARD,
   REPRESENTED BY ITS SECRETARY, VIDHYUTHI
   BHAVANAM, PATTOM, THIRUVANANTHAPURAM.

2. EXECUTIVE ENGINEER, K.S.E.B.,
   ELECTRICAL DIVISION, CHERTHALA.

3. ASSISTANT EXECUTIVE ENGINEER,
   K.S.E.B., ELECTRICAL SUB DIVISION,
   POOCHACKAL, ALAPPUZHA DISTRICT.

4. ASSISTANT ENGINEER,
   ELECTRICAL SECTION, KERALA STATE ELECTRICITY
   BOARD, AROOKUTTY, P.O.NADUVATH NAGAR,
   ALAPPUZHA DISTRICT.

5. K.PURUSHAN, KUZHIKKATT,
   TRICHATTUKULAM P.O., ALAPPUZHA DISTRICT.

BY ADV. SRI.P.P.THAJUDEEN, SC, K.S.E.B
SRI.SHAJI THANKAPPAN
SRI.P.P.SUBHASH CHANDRAN

THIS WRIT PETITION (CIVIL) HAVING BEEN FINALLY HEARD ON 06/08/2007, THE COURT ON THE SAME DAY DELIVERED THE FOLLOWING:

APPENDIX

PETITIONER'S EXHIBITS:

P1: TRUE PHOTOCOPY OF NOTICE DT.16.12.99 INVOLVING QUOTATION TOGETHER WITH THE DETAILED SCHEDULE ACCOMPANYING THE SAME.

P2: TRUE PHOTOCOPY OF LETTER DT.24.2.2000 ISSUED BY R2 TO R5.

P3: TRUE PHOTOCOPY OF REPRESENTATION DT.31.1.07 SUBMITTED BEFORE THE HON'BLE MINISTER FOR ELECTRICITY BY THE 1ST PETITIONER.

TRUE COPY

P.A. TO JUDGE

C.N.RAMACHANDRAN NAIR, J.

.....

W.P.(C) No.13333 of 2007

.....

Dated this the 6th day of August, 2007.

JUDGMENT

Prayer in the W.P. is for direction to KSEB to improve the voltage situation. Work is stated to be awarded to 5th respondent who has done substantial work. It is for the KSEB to get the work done by the contractor without any delay. Counsel for the 5th respondent submitted that rate is not competitive or attractive for him. I do not think there is any need for this court to decide that issue here. It is for the KSEB and 5th respondent to settle dispute, if any, between them. If there is any provision for escalation of rates, 5th respondent is entitled to claim the same. The W.P. is accordingly disposed of directing the KSEB to expedite the work and get it completed either by 5th respondent or if 5th respondent fails, through another contractor in accordance with norms followed, at the earliest and in any case within six weeks from the date of production of copy of this judgment.

C.N.RAMACHANDRAN NAIR
Judge

pms